UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,234	07/12/2004	Reiko Ueno	2004_1040A	3548

513   7590   11/08/2007

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.
2033 K STREET N. W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021

EXAMINER
MUSA, ABDELNABI O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2146	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/501,234	UENO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Abdelnabi O. Musa	2146	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 September 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>25-42</u> is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>25-42</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>09/18/2007; 07/12/2004</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

  1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

  2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

  3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgment is made for the applicant's response and amendment filed on

09/18/2007.

Claims

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as
> set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be
> patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious
> at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said
> subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention
> was made.

1.   Claim(s) 25-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ando et al. Pub. No. (EP 1039725 A2) and further in view of Maciel et al. Patent No.

(US 6;112,248).

Ando et al. teaches et al. teaches all of the claimed limitations and further

teaches a method of starting a first routing device (connection method to newly

connected router Col. 3 line 49; router A, Col. 3, line 49) which connects a plurality of

networks (a plurality of networks are interconnected with the routers Col. 4, Line 10) to

which a plurality of second routing devices (router B, Col. 3, Line 55) are connected

whereas storing master router data and network identification data on each of the

second routing devices (a router that stores information to assign the network

identification Col. 3, Line 58; routing technique is used to identify networks by an ID

Co1.11, Line 49 also see respective figures), wherein the master router data stored on

each of the second routing devices indicates whether each respective routing device of

the second routing devices is a master router located on a path to a parent router that

assigns the network identification data to the networks or (network devices that

interconnect a plurality of networks for communication routing Col. 1, Line 26) a slave

router, which is a router other than a master router (a network identifier uniquely

identifying one of the plurality of networks Col. 4, Line 30); and the network identification

data stored on each of the second routing devices identifies a network (the routing

information is used to identify networks and their corresponding destination Col. 4, Line

6), of the plurality of networks, to which each respective routing device of the second

routing devices is connected (router B, Col. 3, Line 55; router A, Col. 3, line 49) the

master router data from each of the second routing devices on each of the networks

which the first routing device connects (Col. 4, Line 48) However, Ando et al. does not

teach the specifics on detecting, even though he teaches about detecting the router and

obtaining the identification information about, the network identification data stored on

each of the second routing devices that identifies a network also does not teach the

specifics on acquiring the networks based on the identification data detected by the

master routed located on the path to a parent router that assigns the identification data

and further Ando et al does not teach how disabling a functionality of the first routing

device is done when the number of detected master routers is zero or two or more.

Maciel et al. teaches detecting technique including detecting the network identification

data stored to identify the newly connected router to the network (Col. 9, line 42; Col. 9, line 63) also teaches obtaining the address and identification data from the master router and acquire the right path to the parent router to be recognized by the networks (Col. 5, Line 66) and further teaches disabling a functionality of the first routing device when the number of detected devices is reached a calculated value (Col. 6, line 5; Col. 8, Line 49)

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was mad to have modified Ando et al. by the teaching of Maciel et al. because detecting and acquiring the identification data for the new router in the network must be enabled at all times and ready to detect any newly added device and further one must count for the sleeping mode or the disabling function of the first routing device when the number of detected master routers is set to agreed on instructions.

2.   Claim(s) 36-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ando et al. Pub. No. (EP 1039725 A2) and further in view of Maciel et al. Patent No. (US 6,112,248)..

Ando et al. teaches et al. teaches all of the claimed limitations and further teaches computer-readable recording medium storing a program (Col. 3, line 24-66), the program causing a computer to execute (Col. 3, Line 56; Col. 6, line 49; Col. 8, line 21) a method of starting a first routing device (connection method to newly connected router Col. 3 line 49; router A, Col. 3, line 49) which connects a plurality of networks (a plurality of networks are interconnected with the routers Col. 4, Line 10) to which a

plurality of second routing devices (router B, Col. 3, Line 55) are connected whereas

storing master router data and network identification data on each of the second routing

devices (a router that stores information to assign the network identification Col. 3, Line

58; routing technique is used to identify networks by an ID Co1.11, Line 49 also see

respective figures), wherein the master router data stored on each of the second routing

devices indicates whether each respective routing device of the second routing devices

is a master router located on a path to a parent router that assigns the network

identification data to the networks or (network devices that interconnect a plurality of

networks for communication routing Col. 1, Line 26) a slave router, which is a router

other than a master router (a network identifier uniquely identifying one of the plurality of

networks Col. 4, Line 30); and the network identification data stored on each of the

second routing devices identifies a network (the routing information is used to identify

networks and their corresponding destination Col. 4, Line 6), of the plurality of networks,

to which each respective routing device of the second routing devices is connected

(router B, Col. 3, Line 55; router A, Col. 3, line 49) the master router data from each of

the second routing devices on each of the networks which the first routing device

connects (Col. 4, Line 48) However, Ando et al. does not teach the specifics on

detecting, even though he teaches about detecting the router and obtaining the

identification information about, the network identification data stored on each of the

second routing devices that identifies a network also does not teach the specifics on

acquiring the networks based on the identification data detected by the master routed

located on the path to a parent router that assigns the identification data and further

Ando et al does not teach how disabling a functionality of the first routing device is done when the number of detected master routers is zero or two or more. Maciel et al. teaches detecting technique including detecting the network identification data stored to identify the newly connected router to the network (Col. 9, line 42; Col. 9, line 63) also teaches obtaining the address and identification data from the master router and acquire the right path to the parent router to be recognized by the networks (Col. 5, Line 66) and further teaches disabling a functionality of the first routing device when the number of detected devices is reached a calculated value (Col. 6, line 5; Col. 8, Line 49)

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was mad to have modified Ando et al. by the teaching of Maciel et al. because detecting and acquiring the identification data for the new router in the network must be enabled at all times and ready to detect any newly added device and further one must count for the sleeping mode or the disabling function of the first routing device when the number of detected master routers is set to agreed on instructions also one must have medium storage loaded with instruction on how to run the claimed method.

Conclusion

Response to Arguments

3.   `Applicant's arguments with respect to claim(s) 23-44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The following are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor:

-       Sidhu et al (US 5,150,464)

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action

The examiner requests, in response to this Office action, support should be shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line(s) in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the examiner in prosecuting the application.

When responding to this office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present, in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdelnabi O. Musa whose telephone number is 571-2701901. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Thru Friday: 7:30am to 5:00pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Pwu can be reached on 571-2726798. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A.M ·

JEFFREY PWU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER